

Salmon and Miller/Walker Basin Planning Effort Project Management Team Meeting

Date: Thursday September 19, 2002

Time: 9:00AM – 11:00AM

Location: City of Burien Public Works Offices

Meeting Summary

Attendees

Steve Clark	City of Burien	206-248-5514
Dan Bath	City of Burien	206-439-3154
Don Monaghan	City of SeaTac	206-439-4716
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac	206-436-4741
Tom Hubbard	Port of Seattle	206-248-7135
Carol Hunter	WSDOT	206-464-1219
Curt Crawford	King County	206-296-8329
Louise Kulzer	King County	206-296-1980
Julie Cairn	King County	206-296-8032
Doug Chin	King County	206-296-8315
Laird O'Rollins	King County	206-296-8014

Introductions

Meeting participants introduced themselves. The goals of the meeting were briefly overviewed.

Feedback on August PMT Meeting Summary

Julie Cairn asked for any feedback on the August PMT Meeting Summary, since it was the first one prepared by her for the group. Was the scope and level of detail ok? Were there any corrections? Some general comments were shared regarding the correct spelling of the City of SeaTac (no hyphen) and of the correct abbreviation for the Washington Stated Department of Transportation being WSDOT. Based on the group discussion, Julie will reissue the August PMT Meeting Summary as FINAL.

Billing Status Report

Julie Cairn gathered information from the PMT members regarding where invoices should be sent for each agency once they are generated.

Action items are highlighted

Issued as FINAL without any edits following the 10/03/02 PMT Meeting

The group also discussed the options for billing the 2002 work, and preferences for when credits should be applied for grant and CIP funded work. The largest financial impact would be borne by the City of Burien. They did not have a preference about the timing of applying the credits for grant and CIP funded work, and they are amenable to either option. One PMT member suggested we go ahead and “clear out the grant funded work and collect on it” Since the PMT membership did not have a preference, Julie asked the King County finance staff if they had a preference. Finance staff prefer to apply all accrued credits/offsets at the time bills are generated, rather than delaying any one portion. Based on this, billings to partner agencies will incorporate all offsets/credits for work funded by other sources, as the work is completed.

General Project Announcements and Discussion

Louise discussed the current status of the Inter Local Agreement (ILA) execution by King County Council, and some of the issues that have come up requiring additional discussions.

Louise also mentioned that about 1/3 of the right of entry letters were signed and returned, allowing access to Miller Creek. There is some ongoing misinformation concerning the connection between the Miller/Salmon Basin Planning Efforts and potential benefits to the Port and the 3rd runway project. It was agreed that a fact sheet should be developed for the Miller / Salmon project, and that it should be sent out to those individuals who received the right of entry letters. It could also serve as a tool to otherwise communicate with interested parties.

Louise will draft a fact sheet and email it out to the PMT members by Friday 9/27/02. The Draft can be discussed at the 10/03/02 PMT meeting if it is not finalized prior to that meeting.

The definition of “regional”

The group discussed the definition of regional and local taken from the Des Moines Basin Plan as suggested at the August PMT Meeting.

Carol Hunter noted that the term regional was usually applied at a broader scale in her work, for instance, the three-county area. It was suggested that the term “regional” be changed to “basin-wide” or other similar term to provide a more specific context.

The group discussed the Des Moines Plan definitions. Based on the group discussions, Julie Cairn will revise the definitions and email them out to the PMT for concurrence or further discussion. These definitions will be finalized at the 10/3/02 meeting if they are not resolved ahead of the meeting via email.

Build out Conditions Assumptions

The August PMT meeting discussion of the build-out condition assumptions resulted in several questions. Louise discussed these issues with the King County modeling staff, and brought answers to the September PMT meeting. The group discussed elements of the handout, including logistical issues pertaining to differences that currently exist

Action items are highlighted

Issued as FINAL without any edits following the 10/03/02 PMT Meeting

between the King County 1998 Manual and the Ecology 2001 Manual. The timing of updates was discussed, as well as program equivalency expectations. Louise explained our modeler's logic for using the 1998 King County Manual. If we apply the 1998 King County Manual standard to new development, it would give us the most extreme "worst case" scenario. The Ecology Manual would require more flow control for redevelopment projects, and depending on the amount of redevelopment we assume, may not describe a scenario having the most impact. Since folks are interested in investigating the drainage standard that is "really" needed for the Miller basin, much as they did for the Des Moines basin, the approach of using the 1998 King County Manual made sense. The later scenarios that are modeled can then explore what effect the Ecology standard would have. No objections to this logic were voiced.

The build-out assumptions need to be agreed upon, and then supplied to the King County modeling staff so they can run the model under the various scenarios. We will carry this item forward to the October 3 meeting to make sure all are in agreement. Please revisit the attached "buildout" file.

Salmon Creek Preliminary Problems

Laird O'Rollins provided an overview of the ecological condition of the Salmon Basin, and presented the preliminary list of ecological problems/issues in the basin.

Doug Chin presented the preliminary list of engineering problems/issues in the basin. He also presented information on the geological and water quality problems / issues identified by other King County staff.

The matrix of problems is included as an attachment at the end of this document. There was good discussion of the information presented, and of potential information gaps that warrant additional follow up and/or field work prior to the next PMT meeting on October 3rd.

A map was also used during the discussion that is NOT attached to this document.

The group did not identify any additional problems, although they provided clarification on some that were identified. Additionally, the discussion identified several near term follow up tasks for Doug Chin, Laird O'Rollins and Dan Bath regarding:

1. The Segale property dam (blockage) and upstream culvert condition,
2. Potential life safety issues at the lower face of the slide area,
3. Investigation of the ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the manhole and piping system on the beach, and
4. The structural condition of the old government line at or under Ambaum

One member of the PMT requested that the "Source" information on the problem matrix be expanded to include a more detailed bibliography.

Action items are highlighted

Issued as FINAL without any edits following the 10/03/02 PMT Meeting

Potential items to discuss at the next meeting (October 3, 2002)

1. Discuss and finalize Fact Sheet (if not already complete)
2. Discuss Project Success Criteria (delayed from September agenda due to lack of time)
3. Get concurrence on revised definitions of regional/basin-wide and local (if not already complete), build-out scenario assumptions.
4. Schedule and budget update
5. Continue discussion of prioritization criteria (Des Moines Basin Criteria handed out at September 19, 2002 meeting, and attached again below)
6. Continue discussion of Salmon Creek Preliminary Problems, including the results of additional work done after the 9/19/02 PMT meeting.
7. Sort Salmon Creek Problems as Basin-wide vs. Local (if we feel we have enough information to do this, and we have gotten concurrence on the definitions.)

Steve is looking into reserving a larger meeting space for the October 3rd meeting. This would likely be at the Burien City Hall.

PMT members need to let Louise know what technical resources and/or staff would be useful to have at the October meeting, so she can schedule accordingly.

Meeting Handouts referenced in the minutes (double click to open file)

ILA Billing Contacts	091902PMTAtt01
Salmon Basin Preliminary Problem Matrix	091902PMTAtt02
Des Moines Basin Plan Prioritization Criteria	091902PMTAtt03

Action items are highlighted

Issued as FINAL without any edits following the 10/03/02 PMT Meeting

Miller/Salmon Creek Basin Planning Project

Billing Address Information

September 18, 2002

Updated at the September 19, 2002 PMT Meeting

PMT Member Name and Address	Is this where bills should be sent? If Not, fill in next column	Where and to whom bills should be sent (if different from PMT member)
Carol Hunter WSDOT 401 2nd Ave South #580 Seattle, WA 98104-2448	Yes, Attn: Carol Hunter	N/A
Stephen Clark Public Works Director City of Burien 415 SW 150 th Burien WA 98166	Yes, Attn: Steve Clark	N/A
Don Monaghan Public Works Director City of SeaTac 17900 International Blvd Suite 401 SeaTac 98188	No	Same address as Don Monaghan, but to the Attn: of Dale Schroeder
Tom Hubbard Port of Seattle 17900 International Boulevard, Suite 301 SeaTac, WA 98188-4980	Yes, Attn: Tom Hubbard	N/A

DRAFT -- SALMON CREEK BASIN PROBLEMS
September 18, 2002

A survey of existing information about problems was performed in the Salmon Creek Basin to assess stream, wetland and associated wildlife habitat condition and problems, geologic problems, engineering and drainage problems, and water quality problems. In most cases, existing information sources were used to determine and describe problems. In the case of Ecological and Geological disciplines, a stream walk was made to determine problems. After finalization, the existing problems in the basin will be prioritized, and for problems identified as regional, sufficient engineering and environmental analysis will take place to identify solutions for the highest priority problems of regional significance.

Problem categories

1. Ecological (stream flows and habitat, fisheries, wetlands)
2. Geological (steep, unstable slopes)
3. Drainage and Engineering (flooding, infrastructure)
4. Water Quality (streams, wetlands, lakes, groundwater)

Table 1: Initial Problem Identification

No	Problem	Location	Description	Trib. & River Mile	Possible Additional investigations / Possible solutions	Source
			ECOLOGICAL			
1	Habitat	Reach 3	Upstream of sedimentation problems. Channel has good pool/riffle habitat	0362.045-0.6	Electroshock stream to id fish	Field survey, 2002
2	Stream	Reach 1	Channelized and very simplified, with no pools	0362.03	Remove rip-rap and re-meander stream	Field survey, 2002
3	Stream	Reach 3	Salmon Creek mainstem dries up	0362.06		Field survey, 2002
4	Stream	Reach 2	Trib 0362G contributes most of baseflow to system	0362G.02	Electroshock stream to id fish	Field survey, 2002
5	Stream	Downstream of mouth of trib 0362G	Trib 0362G enters Salmon Creek (09.0362) Channel cuts through recent deposits of sand and gravel 6 feet deep w/debris jams 5-7 ft tall.	0362.45	Build sediment pond to trap and remove sediment	Field survey, 2002
6	Fisheries	Reach 2	Channel very disturbed due to massive sedimentation with large fish passage barriers. No suitable in-stream habitat for spawning or rearing.	0362.03-0.4	Add more LWD to entrap sediment	Field survey, 2002
7	Fisheries	Reach 1	Reputed blockage located on Segale property. No access to verify	0362.02	Obtain permission to inspect and analyze blockage	Various reports
8	Fisheries	Reach 1	No fish observed during stream assessment	0362.05	Electroshock stream to id fish	Field survey, 2002

9	Wetland	Mallard Lake Park (Kingston pond)	Privately owned lake abutting White Center Park. Extensive shoreline erosion, waterfowl overuse, litter and probable poor water quality, apartment flooding		Lake could be connected to KC Parks and adjacent vacant land to create wetlands and form Greenway.	Field survey, 2002
10	Wetland	SW 108 th St and 10Ave SW	Isolated wetland located on vacant parcel.		Could form middle link to Greenway linking White Center Pond to Lake Garret.	Field survey, 2002
11	Wetland	White Center Pond	Inventoried as 1.7 acres but much larger. High use urban park w/numerous trails and camps		Could be enlarged/enhanced to create additional wetland area, provide R/D.	Field survey, 2002
12	Wetland	Lake Hicks	Mosaic of seasonally connected wetlands in high use urban park		Wetlands could be enhanced to improve wildlife habitat (eg: amphibians).	Field survey, 2002
24	Wetland	White Center Heights	Wetland at White Center Park poor quality		Wetland could be enhanced, potential for link to greenway	Field survey, 2002
			GEOLOGICAL			
13	Erosion	Head of trib 0362G	Massive landslide at head of trib 0362G	0362G.01	Additional analysis to determine how to stabilize scarp	Field survey, 2002
14	Erosion/Sediment Transport	All of ravine above sewage plant	On-going large landslides, small slumps, soil creep and piping transport sediment to the stream system. Limited stream channel and bank erosion contributes to slumping of banks. Sediment is primarily sand, with some gravel, silt and minor amounts of clay.	0362, 0362B, 0362G, 0362H, 0362I	The scale and cost of controlling erosion processes prohibitive. In-stream structures to control sediment transport could be considered, but may be impractical.	Field survey, 2002
14 B	Potential Ground Movement	Ravine	Risk of damage to sewer and stormwater pipelines through ravine due to soil movement around pipelines (0362 0.3 - 0.6). Potential for damage to private property at top of steep slopes.		Based on past performance, level of risk to pipelines appears low. Risk to private property not assessed (check Burien records).	Field survey, 2002; AESI report, 1999
			DRAINAGE & ENGINEERING			
15	Flooding	Standring Road	Flooding along road, backup from beach manhole that is damaged.		Access to assess problem is issue.	Burien, King County drainage complaints
16	Flooding	Lake Garrett (also called Lake Hicks)	Flows overcome existing pump system and cause flooding		Conduct study re: correcting pump deficiencies. Determine downstream improvements to drainage system, tightline, needed as a result.	King County WLRD:
17	Infrastructure	Lower Salmon Creek	Old Government Sewer line lacks capacity and is deteriorating under Ambaum Road		Conduct engineering investigation of condition of line.	Ken Krank, WLRD
18	Infrastructure	Basin-wide	Under-utilized surface detention. Potential R/D in surface depressions appears under-utilized.		Investigate opportunities for increased live storage in depressions.	Field survey, 2002 City of Burien Stormwater Plan.

19	Incorrect Mapping	King County portion of basin	The drainage system in King County is not adequately mapped. Information may be inaccurate or does not exist.		Improve mapping	KC Road data files
			WATER QUALITY			
20	Lake WQ	Lake Garrett	<p>Listed on 303(d) list for exceeding water quality standards for Total Phosphorous</p> <p>Periodic blooms of blue-green algae</p> <p>Receives mostly untreated stormwater flows from surrounding residential area</p> <p>Eutrophic</p>		Implementation of nutrient control measures in watershed important to restoring lake water quality and stabilizing the trophic character of the lake.	King County Lake Water Quality, November 2001
21	Stormwater /stream	Basin-wide	<p>Stormwater runoff quality likely is poor</p> <p>Most commercial areas do not have stormwater treatment facilities</p> <p>Current residential areas do not have stormwater treatment facilities</p> <p>Future residential development will probably not trigger treatment requirements.</p>			Commercial facility files
22	Stormwater /stream	Basin-wide	<p>Pollutant Source Controls</p> <p>Businesses are not diligent in implementing pollutant source controls.</p>		Mostly problem for Salmon Creek from the western portion of the basin; eastern basin bypasses Salmon Creek	Cedar/Green Source Control Project; 1997
23	Groundwater	Basin-wide	<p>Failing and Unsuitable septic systems</p> <p>Old failing septic systems in high density areas</p> <p>Businesses using septic systems – inappropriate wastes for undersized and old designs.</p>		Unconfirmed for Salmon Creek; personal knowledge of unsewered areas; waiting for info from sewer district	Health Department; Southwest Suburban Sewer District

Problem Prioritization

(Modeled after Section 3.8 of Des Moines Creek Basin Plan)

Steps

1. Take the list of identified problems
2. Classify the problems as Regional or Local
3. Apply points to each problem based on the Prioritization Criteria below.
4. Categorize problems as High, Moderate, or Low priority based on the total number of points assigned.
5. The PMT agrees on the prioritized list.
6. The PMT gives the prioritized list to the technical team to further focus their analysis and recommendations.

Description of Prioritization Criteria

Significance/Impact to Systems: For a stream system to work, a number of physical and biological forces must be roughly in balance. Some problems pose a much greater risk to the balance than others. The environmental significance of the problem to the overall health of the stream system was used as a key criterion.

Points	Meaning
0	The problem has little significance on the overall stream system
50	The problem impacts the stream system
100	The problem has the capacity to undermine the health of the stream system

Affects PMT Goal Attainment: The PMT set specific goals for the Salmon and Miller/Walker basin planning efforts. Problems that interfere with the ability of the project to attain these stated goals are higher priority than problems that do not interfere with the accomplishment of these goals.

Points	Meaning
0	The problem does not interfere with goal attainment
50	The problem provides some interference with goal attainment
100	The problem severely interferes with goal attainment

Threatens Significant Infrastructure: Several substantial investments in infrastructure already exist within the basins, and are potentially impacted by the stream system. Infrastructure consists of stormwater and wastewater pipelines, bridges and culverts, [add buildings or other structures or resources of significance].

Points	Meaning
0	The problem does not threaten infrastructure
50	The problem poses some threat to infrastructure
100	The problem definitely poses a substantial threat to a significant piece of infrastructure [define significant piece of infrastructure]

Problem Categorization:

Total Points	Categorization of Priority
125 – 200	High Priority
75 – 124	Moderate Priority
0 – 74	Low Priority

What about 200 – 300?